

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

March 29, 2018

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653 larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643 andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ethan Lavine, Chief of Bay Resources and Permits (415/352-3618 ethan.lavine@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Potrero Power Plant Station Redevelopment; First Pre-Application Review
(For Design Review Board consideration April 9, 2018)

Project Summary

Project Proponent. California Barrel Company, LLC

Project Representatives. Enrique Landa, Erin Epperson, and Tina Chang (Associate Capital, Developer); Kevin Conger and Justin Aff (CMG, Landscape Architect); Kristen Hall (Perkins + Will, Urban Designer; Sam Yao (SGH, Coastal Engineer); and Angelo Obertello (CBG, Civil Engineer)

Project Site. The approximately 29-acre project site is located on the southern waterfront of the City and County of San Francisco, at the location of the closed Potrero Power Plant Station. The project site is bound by the 22nd Street to the north, the Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south, and Illinois Street to the west (Exhibit 2).

Existing Conditions. The site was first developed in the mid-1800s and used for manufactured gas plant operations. Around 1910, a power plant was constructed that remained in operation until 2011. Though now closed, the power plant is still extant at the project site. On part of the project site there are various buildings associated with the power plant, and a PG&E switchyard located along Illinois Street. The project site is located within Third Street Industrial District. Due to the historic land uses, soil and groundwater remediation is required at much of the project site, with remediation activities currently underway (Exhibits 4 and 5).

No public access to the Bay exists at the project site along the 1,170-foot-long predominantly riprap shoreline. There are several over-water and in-water structures associated with the historic use of the site, including several intake structures, an outfall, a sheet pile wall and a concrete seawall. The nearest shoreline access exists at the City-owned Warm Water Cove Park, at 24th Street. There is no public access to the adjacent shoreline at the neighboring shoreline properties, including the Pier 70 complex to the north, and a storage/distribution facility to the south. The Pier 70 site immediately to the north is proposed for redevelopment as a mixed-use residential and commercial site with a waterfront park (Exhibit 3).¹ The San Francisco Bay Trail and Blue/Greenway runs along the perimeter of the project site on Illinois Street, where it consists of a sidewalk and striped (Class II) bike lanes.

¹ The Board reviewed designs for the proposed redevelopment of the Pier 70 site at its October 6, 2016 and February 26, 2018 meetings.

While the majority of the project site is owned in fee by the project proponent, portions of site are owned by the City and County of San Francisco, the Port of San Francisco, and PG&E.

Proposed Project. The project presented in the attached exhibits does not illustrate a specific design, but rather a conceptual one based on design controls that will be used as a framework and the parameters for the ultimate design of the project. The proposed project would redevelop the site to allow for a mix of uses including residential, commercial office, life/science office, retail, parks, community facilities, light industrial, hotel, and assembly uses. The project involves demolition of some, but not all of the existing structures on site, and the construction of a street grid and approximately 5.4 million gross square feet within buildings ranging from 65 to 180 feet in height (roughly 7 to 18 stories), with one building at 300-feet tall (approximately 30 stories). The power plant structure is proposed for adaptive reuse, possibly as a hotel, though the project proponent is also exploring an alternative in which the plant is mostly demolished with only the 300-foot-tall boiler stack retained and repurposed (Exhibit 25). At full buildout, the project proponent estimates that the project would generate approximately 5,500 to 6,100 residents and 4,150 to 6,000 employees at the project site (Exhibits 6 and 7).

The proposed project would include approximately 6.3 acres of parks and open space, including the majority of the 2.6-acre area within the Commission's 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction. The most significant park areas within the project site are the Power Station Park, located across two blocks within the interior of the project site, and the Waterfront Park, running the length of the approximately 1,170-foot-shoreline. A rooftop public soccer field is also proposed atop the parking structure (Block 5) (Exhibit 8).

1. **Power Station Park.** The 1.22-acre Power Station Park, located outside of BCDC jurisdiction, would split across two blocks within the interior of the project site from Georgia Lane to Delaware Street. The prominent feature within the eastern portion of the park would be a flexible lawn for a variety of activities, including youth soccer, outdoor movies, community events, and casual lounging and play. The eastern portion of the park would also include seating and barbeque areas. The western portion of the park would be a mostly hardscape plaza, with fitness equipment, sculptural play features, public seating, and an architectural canopy structure. The park would intersect with the 0.7-acre Louisiana Paseo at its western edge, a car-free north-south plaza running between the 23rd Street and the proposed Humboldt Street. The paseo would feature seating, game tables (e.g. tennis and chess), planters, and bike parking.
2. **Waterfront Park.** The 3.7-acre Waterfront Park would run north-south along the shoreline, ranging from approximately 60 to 120 feet in width. The Waterfront Park is organized around a minimum 20-foot-wide segment of the Bay Trail (also the designated Blue Greenway at this location). The Bay Trail would connect to the planned trail at the Pier 70 site and run south to 23rd Street, where it would turn west and connect back to its current alignment at Illinois Street. No Bay Trail connection is planned along the shoreline at the southern end of the site, as no access currently exists on the adjacent property. However, a trail extension is proposed to run along the area between 23rd Street and the southern property line. This extension could be adapted to become the designated Bay Trail at some future point should a shoreline trail be developed at the adjacent property (Exhibit 8).

The project proponent conceptually divides Waterfront Park into the following sub-areas—a series of parks and plazas that tie the waterfront back into the urban fabric (Exhibits 10 and 11). The areas are described roughly from north to south:

- a. **Craig Lane Paseo** would be constructed to create a pedestrian thru-way providing a perpendicular connection to the Bay Trail at the terminus of an east-west vehicular road (Craig Lane) to the Bay Trail. This section would connect to the shoreline at the proposed Pier 70 project site.
- b. **Humboldt Street Plaza** (Exhibit 21), located between Blocks 4 and 9, would include the Bay Trail, a Bay overlook structure and an approximately 4,500-square-foot planting area. A proposed planting palette is shown in Exhibit 24. To the west of the Bay Trail, a maximum 65-foot-tall hotel building (Block 9) and a terraced (65-feet tall stepping up to 85-feet tall) residential or R&D/office building (Block 4) would frame the plaza. Both buildings would include ground floor cafés or restaurant seating along the waterfront. An 11,000-square-foot plaza lined with trees would be constructed between the two buildings, running from Delaware Street to the Bay Trail. Space is provided for market stalls within the plaza, to be erected on event days.
- c. **Turbine Plaza and Bay Overlook Terrace** (Exhibits 19 and 20) would include, to the east of the Bay Trail, a floating recreational dock, a wharf/overlook terrace with public seating, and an approximately 3,500-square-foot lawn. To the west of the Bay Trail and opposite the proposed recreational dock is the power plant's Unit 3 building. The project proponent is exploring reuse of Unit 3 as a hotel, in which case café or restaurant seating at the ground floor is envisioned. An alternative in which the Unit 3 building is demolished is also under consideration, in which case a new hotel or residential building would be constructed at this location. Directly north of the Unit 3 building would be a partially enclosed public plaza linking Delaware Street and the Bay Trail, which could incorporate a remnant craneway structure from the power plant.
- d. **Stack Plaza and Garden** (Exhibits 17 and 18) would include a combination of hardscape and planted areas surrounding the power plant's 300-foot-tall boiler stack, which would be retained and reused, possibly as a café or bar. The Bay Trail at this location would run adjacent to the riprapped shoreline, separated by a narrow strip of planting.
- e. **The Point** (Exhibits 15 and 16) is envisioned as a quieter space with planted areas, a grove of trees, an informal discovery play area, and casual seating and picnicking facilities. A viewing platform would be constructed atop an existing concrete intake structure that extends approximately 50 feet out over the Bay.

Food and drink vendors would be located at locations (not yet determined) within the park, with up to five mobile carts and three semi-permanent kiosks. Special events are proposed to occur within the waterfront park for a period of up to 72 hours per event, up to twice a month, up to 12 events each year.

Phasing. The project would be constructed in approximately seven overlapping phases, with each phase lasting three to five years. Following the initial demolition, site preparation, and rough grading for the entire site, the first phase of construction is anticipated to start on the southeast portion of the project site and the last phase of construction would end in the northwest portion of the project site. Total construction is estimated to occur over a 15-year period, and is anticipated to run from the beginning of 2020 to the end of 2034, but could occur over a somewhat longer or shorter period, depending on market conditions and permitting requirements.

Resilience and Adaptation to Rising Sea Level. The project proponents indicate that flood and sea level rise protection measures would include physical improvements to the shoreline—including construction of rock slope revetments, berms, and bulkheads—and grading to raise the elevation of the full project site. The grade at the shoreline would be increased by approximately 3 to 7 feet (+13 to +17.5 NAVD88) to provide protection against a 100-year coastal flood in addition to 66 inches of sea level rise (+17.5 NAVD88). The finished floor elevations for the ground floors of all buildings fronting onto or within the Waterfront Park would likewise be elevated to +17.5 NAVD88 (Exhibit 13). Existing Mean Higher High Water is at elevation +6.40 NAVD88 (+11.9 NAVD88 at 66 inches of sea level rise.)

Commission Findings, Policies & Guidelines

Physical and Visual Access. The San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan) policies on Public Access state, in part, that “maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline....” Bay Plan policies on Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views state, in part: “All bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay....” The Commission’s Public Access Design Guidelines state, in part: “View opportunities, shoreline configuration and access points are factors that determine a site’s inherent public access opportunities.” The guidelines also state that viewing the Bay is the “most widely enjoyed ‘use’ and projects should be designed to enhance and dramatize views of the Bay.”

The Bay Plan policies on Recreation state: “Interpretive information describing the natural, historical, and cultural resources should be provided in waterfront parks where feasible.” The Commission’s Public Access Design Guidelines state, in part, that public access spaces should create a “sense of place” and should be designed in a manner that “feels public,” that is, “in a way that makes the shoreline enjoyable to the greatest number of people.”

The Bay Plan Recreation policies state, in part, that “[d]iverse and accessible water-oriented recreational facilities...should be provided to meet the needs of a growing and diversifying population and should be well distributed around the Bay and improved to accommodate a broad range of water-oriented recreational activities for people of all races, cultures, ages and income levels.” The policies state that waterfront parks should be “provided wherever possible,” and that they “should emphasize hiking, bicycling, riding trails, picnic facilities, swimming, environmental, historical and cultural education and interpretation, viewpoints, beaches, and fishing facilities.” Where practicable, the policies state that “access facilities for non-motorized small boats should be incorporated into waterfront parks.” Additionally, parking that accommodates expected use should be provided, as well as “launching facilities, restrooms, rigging areas, equipment storage” and should be accessible to ensure boaters can easily launch their watercraft.

The proposed project would provide an approximately 3.7-acre waterfront park, which would include a minimum 20-foot-wide Bay Trail, overwater Bay viewing platforms, a lawn, planting areas, several hardscape plazas, a recreational floating dock, an interpretive play area, and a variety of public seating areas. Some additional amenities commonly associated with waterfront parks, particularly amenities associated with launches for small boats (e.g., restrooms, equipment storage, etc.), have not been identified as project elements within the attached exhibits. While detailed plans regarding historic interpretive elements to be included as part of the proposed design have not been provided to date, remnants of the historic use of the site are proposed to be retained and incorporated into the Waterfront Park design, such as the boiler stack, Unit 3 building, and craneway structure.

Circulation. The Bay Plan policies on Public Access state, in part that “[i]mprovements should be designed and built to encourage...movement to and along the shoreline...” and that “[a]ccess to and along the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available. Diverse and interesting public access experiences should be provided....” The Commission’s Public Access Design Guidelines state, in part, that a shoreline development should “...provide a clear and continuous transition to adjacent developments,” “use local public street networks to inform shoreline site design and to extend the public realm to the Bay,” and “provide connections perpendicular to the shoreline.”

The proposed project would extend the current street grid along 22nd and 23rd Streets to within the site (though 22nd Street would be developed as part of the adjacent Pier 70 project) and construct a new internal street grid and various pedestrian ways. A parking-protected bike lane (Class IV) would run along the north side of 23rd Street, while dedicated (Class II) bike lanes would run along the south side of 23rd Street, Maryland Street and Georgia Lane, and a shared (Class III) bike lane would run along Humboldt, Delaware and Georgia Streets. Outside of the project boundary, a dedicated (Class II) bike lane would be provided along Illinois Street and 22nd Street between Illinois and Louisiana Streets. East of Louisiana, along 22nd Street, a shared (Class III) lane is proposed.

Approximately 83 on-street parking spaces would be provided within the development, including 11 accessible parking spaces, as well as passenger and freight loading zones. In addition, an 819-space centralized parking facility is proposed adjacent to the southern switchyard (Block 5), and 1,803 below-grade or podium parking spaces would be provided within buildings across the project site.

A 20-foot-wide minimum, multi-use (Class I) trail would be constructed on the shoreline to serve as the San Francisco Bay Trail, also the San Francisco Blue Greenway at this location. The trail would run from the planned connection with the Pier 70 site at the north to 23rd Street to the south. While no continuous shoreline connection is planned along the shoreline at the far southern end of the project site, a 16-foot-wide Bay Trail extension at the southern end of the site is designed which might become the designated route of the Bay Trail should that property be redeveloped in the future.

Sea Level Rise. The Bay Plan policies on Public Access state, in part, that “...public access should be sited, designed, managed, and maintained to avoid significant adverse impacts from sea level rise and shoreline flooding,” and that “[a]ny public access provided as a condition of development should either be required to remain viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding, or equivalent access consistent with the project should be provided nearby.”

As discussed above, the project includes a variety of responses to achieve resiliency to inundation anticipated from a 100-year storm after 66 inches of sea level rise. These responses include raising the grade of the site, and constructing or strengthening rock slope revetments, berms or bulkheads. Upon raising the grade of the site, there will be a roughly 2-foot difference in elevation

from the proposed grade at the Pier 70 (+15.5 NAVD88) site to the north and an approximately 3-foot difference in elevation of the project site and the neighboring property to the south, requiring the construction of a retaining wall on land that would presumably act as a shoreline protective device in the future should the neighboring southern parcel remain at its current grade.

Board Questions

The Board’s advice and recommendations are sought on the following issues regarding the design of the proposed public access:

Physical and Visual Access:

1. Is the proposed public access—in terms of area and the amenities provided—sufficient to accommodate the expected level of use from new residents, employees, and visitors to this segment of the shoreline?
2. Does the design of the public space take advantage of the Bay setting, and does it provide for adequate opportunities to get close to and experience the water?
3. Are the public access areas designed in a manner that “feels public” and makes the shoreline enjoyable to the greatest number of people?
4. Will the proposed public access facilities provide a sufficiently broad range of water-oriented recreational activities for a diverse population, including people of all races, cultures, ages, income levels, physical abilities, and interests? Are there additional amenities needed to achieve this type of access?
5. Does the design take full advantage of the site’s historic and cultural attributes to create a project with a unique “sense of place” and identity? What are the Board’s thoughts on appropriate means of interpretation of the site’s historical and cultural attributes to the public?
6. Does the design organize shoreline development to allow Bay views between buildings, and does it enhance and dramatize views of the Bay from public thoroughfares and other public spaces?

Circulation:

7. Does the proposed project provide clear connections for all users to the Bay from Illinois Street?
8. Does the designated Bay Trail route provide clear and continuous transitions for users? Will a clear and obstacle-free connection be provided where it connects to the planned Pier 70 development to the north? Along its alignment onto 23rd Street and ultimately Illinois Street?
9. Does the design minimize the potential for conflicts among pedestrians and cyclists within the shoreline open space area? Would certain areas benefit from providing additional physical public access?

Sea Level Rise:

10. What are the potential adverse effects to the proposed public access improvements from anticipated sea level rise, and what are appropriate design responses to achieve resiliency to, or adapt to, these conditions?
11. Are there additional opportunities to provide interim access closer to the shoreline and Bay waters as part of the proposed adaptation and resiliency measures?